

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DEXTER DEAN BARBER,

Petitioner,

vs.

Civil Action No. 16-cv-11615  
HON. BERNARD A. FRIEDMAN

CAROL HOGAN,

Respondent.

**OPINION AND ORDER DISMISSING THE PETITION FOR A  
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND DENYING A CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

The Court has before it Dexter Barber's pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner is a patient currently confined at the Forensic Psychiatry Center in Saline, Michigan. Petitioner's application for habeas relief was completely illegible and appeared to be the product of acute mental illness. Petitioner also did not pay the required filing fee when he filed his petition, nor did he submit an application to proceed in forma pauperis. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a); 28 U.S.C. § 1915; Rule 3 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases. The Court, therefore, issued two orders to correct petitioner's filing deficiencies on May 9, 2016, requiring petitioner to file a legible petition and either pay the filing fee or submit a properly completed in forma pauperis application by June 8, 2016. The order provided that if petitioner did not correct his filing deficiencies his case may be dismissed.

On May 25, 2016, petitioner submitted a document that begins by stating, "Motion to proceed in forma pauperis courts. . . ." followed by what can best be described as the same set of distinctive scribbles that appear in the bulk of his petition. As best as the Court can determine, petitioner repeats the words "vistoues couisuas x26." At some places these words are somewhat legible, and at others they degrade into mere scribbling. In any event, the document filed by

petitioner is insufficient to correct his filing deficiencies.

Because the time for submitting a legible petition and the filing fee or proper application to proceed in forma pauperis has elapsed, the Court dismisses without prejudice the petition for a writ of habeas corpus.

The Court also denies a certificate of appealability because the disposition of the case is not reasonably debatable. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(a); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b).

SO ORDERED.

S/ Bernard A. Friedman  
BERNARD A. FRIEDMAN  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: June 10, 2016  
Detroit, Michigan

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on June 10, 2016, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Kelly Winslow for Carol Mullins  
Case Manager